



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in Southern cities, and over 1700 students at the U. S. Naval Academy at Annapolis and the Military Academy at West Point. The efficiency of these factory operatives and students was found to vary with climatic conditions. From the various sources a map is constructed which shows the distribution of climatic energy or the climatic conditions under which men are most active and efficient in their work, both physical and mental. This map showing the distribution of climatic energy is compared with a map showing the present distribution of civilization and the regions of great climatic energy and stimulus are seen to correspond in a remarkable way with the regions showing the most developed civilization.

The second line of approach to test the climatic hypothesis of civilization is the study of the past. Differences between the present distribution of climatic energy and that of the past are said to be caused by the shifting of the climatic zones which in turn is caused largely by variations in the location of the storm belt. This is a vital point of criticism, as the author readily admits; for students are not yet agreed as to the reality of climatic changes. Until this supposition of climatic change is more definitely established the climatic hypothesis of civilization must remain in doubt.

A wealth of material has been collected by the author to support the thesis of the book. This varies considerably in value. At certain points there are not enough definitely determined facts to make all the links of the chain of evidence equally strong. The author frankly recognizes this and admits the provisional character of his conclusions. Yet there is enough material tending to show the probability of the conclusions reached to warrant the most thoughtful consideration. Even if man is more dependent upon nature than he first thought, the scientific realization of that fact, as Professor Huntington points out, is the first step towards freedom. JAMES G. STEVENS.

THE STOIC PHILOSOPHY (Conway Memorial Lecture). By Gilbert Murray. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1915. Pp. 74.

Whether interested in philosophy or literature, religion or ethics, personal religion or social, the fairly cultured general

reader will find this delightful little book to be a small gift perhaps, but from the larger gods. All too seldom does it happen that a lecturer is at once literary, genial, witty, practical, full of insight, and gifted with the magic of personality. Professor Gilbert Murray, however, shows himself possessed of these traits in this the sixth memorial lecture in honor of the late Moncure D. Conway—American, Methodist minister, Unitarian minister, freethinker, philanthropist, cosmopolitan—a modern stoic whose memory may well be kept green in this lecture on Stoicism.

Take this as a sample of the author's power of clear-cut and simple yet eloquent interpretation: "Rank, riches, social distinction, health, pleasure, barriers of race or nation—what will those things matter before the tribunal of truth? Not a jot. Nothing but goodness is good. It is what you are that matters—what you yourself are; and all these things are not you. They are external, they depend not on you alone, but on other people. The thing that really matters depends on you, and on none but you. From this there flows a very important and surprising conclusion. You possess already, if you only really knew it, all that is worth desiring. The good is yours if you but will it. You need fear nothing. You are safe, inviolable, utterly free. A wicked man or an accident can cause you pain, break your leg, make you ill, but no earthly power can make you good or bad except yourself, and to be good or bad is the only thing that matters." What *is* goodness? "It is living or acting according to Phusis [Nature], working with Phusis [Evolution] in her eternal effort towards perfection. . . . Living according to nature . . . means living according to the spirit which makes the world grow and progress." Following this is a felicitous statement of the Stoic idea of Nature as a "law which is alive, which is itself life." [Compare Bergson.] But the Stoic 'Phusis' has more 'sense' than Bergson's *élan vital*, for Phusis is purposeful, "like a foreseeing, forethinking power—Providence."

But Nature is not all. It is but God's instrumental self: His essential Self wants coöperation from us. Say the Stoics: "God might have preferred chained slaves for his fellow-workers, but, as a matter of fact, he preferred free men." Play the Game! God "is not a fool to judge you by your mere success or failure.

Success or failure is a thing He can determine without stirring a hand. It hardly interests Him. What interests Him is the one thing which He cannot determine—the action of your free will and conscious will.”

Professor Murray sums up Stoic religion in a phrase borrowed from Professor Edwyn Bevan: “A Friend behind phenomena!”

Possibly a reviewer should sometimes reward his readers. If this idea be permissible, perhaps the reviewer may be pardoned for helping to perpetuate Professor Murray’s illustration of *anti*-stoicism as shown in the celebrated “eighteenth-century lady’s epitaph which ends: ‘Bland, passionate, and deeply religious, she was second cousin to the Earl of Leitrim, and of such is the kingdom of heaven.’” Let us (perhaps pharisaically) rejoice that the epitaph and the spirit that animated it were not “made in America”!

THOMAS PEARCE BAILEY.

WHAT SHOULD I BELIEVE? AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE, GROUNDS AND VALUE OF THE FAITHS OF SCIENCE, SOCIETY, MORALS AND RELIGION. By George Trumbull Ladd. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1915. Pp. xiii + 275.

Twenty-odd years ago President Stanley Hall, the celebrated encyclopædist of adolescence, reviewed one of Dr. Ladd’s books; though admiring the solid scholarliness of the work, he complained of the heaviness of the style. And now we have this same Dr. Ladd writing philosophy for the man in the street! The last score of years, however, have seen the genial author in many lands, and have mellowed his style as well as his thought. Although occasionally he ventures on a trunkline sentence (on page 161, for example, there is a sentence of six-score words), his writing is always clear, often fitting, sometimes felicitous, never cheap. Even when he “quotes” slang for pedagogic purposes, as on pages 173, 175, 177, he dignifies the slang instead of degrading his thought. When we find him speaking (on page seven) of the “petty methods of the *questionnaire* or the psychological laboratory” (Stanley Hall’s pet methods), we can imagine the veteran Ladd still unconsciously “hitting back.”

This book is one of a series. Its predecessors have been: *What Can I Know?* and *What Ought I To Do?* A fourth book